

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**1. Rejection of claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank, Jr. et al. (US 6,546,489), hereinafter "Frank," in view of Stevens (US 2002/0133702):**

5

*Regarding claims 1, 6, and 12:*

Independent claims 1, 6, and 12 have each been amended to overcome the claim rejections. Each of these claims now states that the bootable software  
10 delivery device is connected in a disconnectable manner to a computer, with a connection port used for connecting in a disconnectable manner the software delivery device to the computer. The amendments to the claims are fully supported in the specification such as paragraph [0030], and no new matter is added.

15 On the other hand, in Fig. 3 of Frank, if disk drive 424, host interface 426, and host microprocessor 432 constitute the software delivery device, the software delivery device does not connect to the computer in a disconnectable manner and the host interface 426 does not connect the software delivery device to the computer in a disconnectable manner as recited in the amended claims. The host interface 426 only connects disk drive 424 to  
20 the computer in a disconnectable manner. The host microprocessor 432 might be connecting to the computer in a disconnectable manner in certain ways, but the host interface 426 does not connect the host microprocessor 432, alone or together with disk drive 424, to the computer in a disconnectable manner.

25 The same argument also holds that if disk drive 424, host interface 426, and boot load microcontroller 443 constitute the software delivery device, the software delivery device does not connect to the computer in a disconnectable manner and the host interface 426

does not connect the software delivery device to the computer in a disconnectable manner as recited in the amended claims. The host interface 426 only connects disk drive 424 to the computer in a disconnectable manner. The boot load microcontroller 443 might be connecting to the computer in a disconnectable manner in certain ways, but the host  
5 interface 426 does not connect the boot load microcontroller 443, alone or together with disk drive 424, to the computer in a disconnectable manner.

For these reasons, the combination of Frank and Stevens does not teach all of the limitations of the currently amended claims 1, 6, and 12, and these claims should  
10 be allowable over the cited prior art. Reconsideration of claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-12 is respectfully requested. Claims 2-4, 7-9, and 11 are dependent on claims 1, 6, and 12, and should be allowed if their corresponding base claims are allowed.

15 **2. Rejection of claims 5 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frank and Stevens and further in view of Strom et al. (US 2004/0003274):**

Claims 5 and 10 are dependent and should be allowed if the corresponding independent  
20 claims are found allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/064,483  
Amdt. dated November 13, 2006  
Reply to Office action of October 4, 2006

Sincerely yours,



Date: 11/13/2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)